

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

After the above amendments, claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 8 and 12 are independent.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by REZAIIFAR et al. (US 2004/0120283 A1)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by REZAIIFAR et al. (US 2004/0120283 A1) (hereafter REZAIIFAR). The Applicant understands REZAIIFAR to disclose a first communication system (hereafter a CDMA2000 1x system) and a second communication system (hereafter an EVDO system). Further, REZAIIFAR teaches requesting an identifier (UATI) necessary in the second region of the EVDO system through an air interface of the CDMA2000 1x system, if a mobile station moves into the second region from the first region while the mobile station monitors the CDMA2000 1x system. UATI information distinguishes terminals from each other and is different in each region. In REZAIIFAR a location registration is requested in the second region of the CDMA2000 1x system through the air interface of the EVDO system, if the mobile station moves into the second region from the first region while the mobile station monitors the CDMA2000 1x system. In other words, the identifier in the EVDO system is requested by the air interface of the CDMA2000 1x system and the location registration in the CDMA2000 1x system is performed by the air interface of the EVDO system.

On the contrary, according to an example of the Applicant's present invention, in a first communication system (hereafter a CDMA2000 1x system) and a second communication system (hereafter an EVDO system), if a mobile terminal monitors only the CDMA2000 1x system, the mobile terminal transmits location registration information through an air interface of the CDMA2000 1x system and the CDMA2000 1x system transmits the changed location registration information to the EVDO system. More particularly, the changed location registration information is transmitted to PCF(SC/MM). Then, when a paging for packet communications is generated in a network, the EVDO system determines whether to page the terminal through the EVDO system or through the CDMA2000 1x system based on the location

information received from the CDMA2000 1x system. That is, according to an example of the Applicant's present invention, the location registration in the CDMA2000 1x system is performed by the air interface of the CDMA2000 1x system and the location information is transmitted from the CDMA2000 1x system to the EVDO system. After that, when a paging for packet communications is generated in the network, the location information is used for paging in the EVDO system.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, REZAIIFAR fails to teach the mobile communication system transmitting location information to a heterogeneous mobile communication system. In the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner states that elements 260 and 270 in drawing FIG. 6 of REZAIIFAR correspond to a heterogeneous mobile communication system and that element 250 of REZAIIFAR corresponds to a mobile communication system. Further, the Examiner cites paragraph [0067] of REZAIIFAR as disclosing the mobile communication system transmitting location information to a heterogeneous mobile communication system. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that REZAIIFAR discloses the above limitation. REZAIIFAR merely discloses that a wireless communication system 250 includes a first portion 260 and a second portion 270, and REZAIIFAR fails to disclose that the wireless communication system 250 exchanges the location information with the first portion 260 and the second portion 270. In paragraph [0067] of REZAIIFAR, when a MS 268 moves into MSC_2 272 from MSC_1 262, an anchor BSC 264 registers the MS 268 with MSC_2 272. By contrast, the above cited limitation includes the subject matter that a mobile communication system (CDMA2000 1x system) transmits location information to a heterogeneous mobile communication system (EVDO system). Therefore, REZAIIFAR fails to teach the mobile communication system transmitting location information to a heterogeneous mobile communication system.

In addition, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, REZAIIFAR fails to teach the heterogeneous mobile communication system requesting the mobile communication system to page the mobile terminal according to the received information. In the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner states that the above limitation is disclosed in paragraph [0065] of REZAIIFAR. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that REZAIIFAR discloses the above limitation. REZAIIFAR merely discloses that the wireless communication

system 250 includes the first portion 260 and the second portion 270 and fails to disclose that the first portion 260 and the second portion 270 requests paging to the wireless communication system 250. In paragraph [0065] of REZAIIFAR, when a voice call is generated from a network after the MS registers with the MSC_1 262, the MSC sends a page to the MS via the BSC and BTS. On the other hand, the above cited limitation includes the subject matter that the heterogeneous mobile communication system (EVDO system) requests the mobile communication system page the mobile terminal according to the information received from the mobile communication system (CDMA2000 1x system). Therefore, REZAIIFAR fails to teach the heterogeneous mobile communication system requesting the mobile communication system to page the mobile terminal according to the received information.

In view of the above arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn. Claim 12 comprises similar subject matter to claim 1 and is therefore allowable for the same reasons. Moreover, claims 2-7 and 13-18 are dependent claims and are therefore allowable for at least for the above reasons by virtue of their dependence on claims 1 or 12.


Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claim 8, REZAIIFAR fails to teach the step of determining whether the mobile terminal has been location-registered in the mobile communication system or in the heterogeneous mobile communication system with reference to pre-registered location information of the mobile terminal when paging request of the mobile terminal occurs in the heterogeneous mobile communication system. In the Examiner's rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner states that the above limitation is disclosed by paragraphs [0069], [0044] and [0074] of REZAIIFAR. In paragraph [0069] of REZAIIFAR, when the MS 268 is moves into a new MSC region 272, the anchor BSC 264 sends a TunneledRegistrationRequest message to the MS 268 to force the MS 268 to register with the new MSC. In paragraph [0044] of REZAIIFAR, when a subscriber station 104 is moves into 108b region, the subscriber station 104 sends a request of a unique address identifier necessary in the 108b region through an air interface for a voice service. In paragraph [0074] of REZAIIFAR, if the anchor BSC cannot reach a neighboring MSC directly, then the anchor BSC can forward the "A1: Location Updating Request" through a Reflector to the neighboring MSC. Thus, REZAIIFAR fails to teach the step of determining whether the mobile terminal has been

location-registered in the mobile communication system or in the heterogeneous mobile communication system with reference to pre-registered location information of the mobile terminal when paging request of the mobile terminal occurs in the heterogeneous mobile communication system. In view of the above arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 8 be withdrawn. Moreover, claims 9-11 are dependent claims and are therefore allowable for at least for the above reasons by virtue of their dependence on claim 8.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Christian C. Michel
Reg. No. 46,300
Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 4, 2006

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
Main: (202) 659-9076